

^{11x} In this regard a kind of "party-piece" or (more likely) after-dinner talk, "Wrinkles in Ancient Asylum Reports," is interesting for satirizing the recent past of asylum doctoring as ancient Egyptian history. Clark facetiously suggests that "the Pyramids were intended as hospitals for the insane." These "Ancient Egyptians" wrapped their dead Pharaohs in annual reports. The piece was read "at the forty-third annual meeting of the Association of Medical Superintendents of American Institutions for the Insane, held at Newport, R.I., June 18-20, 1880." Clark targets such topical issues as restraint, patronage, the "cooking" of statistics to produce artificially low cure rates, the sensationalism of the press, and even the surgical mutilation of women as practised by colleagues like R.M. Bucke at the London Asylum: "It was also to be expected in that age of divisional medicine that the useful uterus and its appendages should be chargeable with being a prolific cause of insanity Were these detached laboratories even slightly diseased then was the excision declared to be a triumph of medical foresight and skill: were they healthy then was it a good riddance to cut out these supernumeraries. In that barbarous age it was not thought barbarous to unsex the many for the problematic benefit of the few" (9).

^{12x} See Shirley G. Morris, ed., *The Journal of John George Howard* (Toronto: Ontario Heritage Foundation; Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, 198-7), 22. In the context of the Asylum's sheer monumentality, it might be useful to note that it really was built to military specifications. Howard, the principal architect, travelled to Montreal on April 18, 1845 to confirm to one Colonel C.B. Holloway that the Asylum could indeed be defended as a fort.

^{13x} Consider Clark's satire of "sentiment" in a piece, "Wrinkles in Ancient Asylum Reports," read before the Association of Medical Superintendents of American Institutions for the Insane, June 18-20, 1880: "What is restraint? Is a mit, or a sewed sleeve, or an attendant's grip, or seclusion in a room, or a sedative, restraint? If so, then is not a locked bedroom, a secured ward, or a high wall also restraint? Is not a lunatic restrained in a sense when he is curbed from having his own sweet will to the same extent as have the sane? The hair-splitting tendency over petty and unimportant details seems to be inherent in the human race, and the silliness of calling a weakly sentiment a principle has had much vitality" (10).

^{14x11} See "The Case of Louis Riel," *American Journal of Insanity* 42.2 (October, 1885): 265-66. This unsigned item under "Notes and Comments" might have been written by Dr. Daniel Clark, since it contains information similar and language similar to that in Clark's notes, reproduced in C.K. Clarke's "A Critical Study of the Case of Louis Riel," *Queen's Quarterly* 12 (April, 1905): 379-88; 13 (July, 1905): 14-26. In the *Journal of Insanity* article it is noted that Riel was twice confined in Asylums (in Longue Pointe, Montreal and in Beauport, Quebec), and both times afflicted with Megalomania (Dr. Roy's original diagnosis). The article notes the Riel considered himself a prophet, at the centre of a great movement, with the ability to foretell the future. In his trial notes quoted in Dr. C.K. Clarke's article, Daniel Clark observes that "His fidgety way, his swagger, his egotistic attitudes, his evident delight at such a trying hour in being so conspicuous a personage, impressed me very strongly as being so like the insane with delusions of greatness, whether paretics or not" (16). Clark is afraid, however, that his diagnosis is based on appearances "which cannot be described in writing, [although they] are matters of every-day observation by asylum medical officers" (16). In other words, as he admits, his diagnosis is based on professional "intuitions" which "would be laughed out of court by the legal profession" (16). Later in the same notes he records "[Riel] also told me that he wrote a book In it he clearly proved that he was a great prophet, and as a prophet he knew beforehand that a verdict would be given in his favour" (17). The "judicial murder" of Riel was regarded by psychiatrists as a setback for the psychiatric profession in Canada, and subsequently invoked in defence of the insanity defence in particular and of professional opinion in general. Psychiatrists or rather alienists who defended criminals on grounds of insanity were virtually pilloried by the community. In "Some of the Aetiological Factors in Insanity, Also a Few Remarks on Expert Evidence," *The Canada Lancet* 44 (January, 1911): 356-66, C.K. Clarke describes how a party of like-minded alienists including himself and Drs. Workman, Daniel Clark, R.M. Bucke, and Lett, were once openly insulted on their way to court; in the press they were pilloried as hirelings, and in the pulpit reviled in ways that, as Clarke says, applying a favourite trope, "would have done credit to the